R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 016 682 TE 500 056

TEACHING CONDITIONS AND LOADS AT SAN FRANCISCO CITY COLLEGE.

BY- SNEPP, DONALD

ASSOCIATION OF DEPARTMENTS OF ENGLISH, NEW YORK,NY

PUB DATE FEB 68

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.36 7P.

DESCRIPTORS- *ENGLISH CURRICULUM, *JUNIOR COLLEGES, *HIGHER EDUCATION, *TEACHING LOAD, *TEACHING CONDITIONS, ENGLISH PROGRAMS, COLLEGE FRESHMEN, ADMINISTRATOR RESPONSIBILITY, ENGLISH INSTRUCTION, COLLEGE TEACHERS, ENROLLMENT TRENDS, FACULTY RECRUITMENT, TEACHER SALARIES, COLLEGE ENTRANCE EXAMINATIONS, CITY COLLEGE OF SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA,

THE ATTEMPT TO FULFILL OBLIGATIONS TO AN INCREASING NUMBER OF STUDENTS IS A PRIMARY FRUSTRATION OF MANY ENGLISH DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN IN TWO-YEAR COLLEGES IN CALIFORNIA. A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE SIZE AND GROWTH OF THE TWO-YEAR COLLEGE IN CALIFORNIA IS FOLLOWED BY A DISCUSSION OF THE CONDITIONS AT CITY COLLEGE OF SAN FRANCISCO. THE NATURE OF THE ENROLLMENT, THE WAY IN WHICH ENTERING STUDENTS ARE CLASSIFIED, AS WELL AS THE GENERAL AIMS, CURRICULUM, AND STAFF OF THE ENGLISH DEPARTMENT AT CITY COLLEGE ARE DISCUSSED BRIEFLY. SPECIFIC DATA AND EXAMPLES ARE ALSO GIVEN FOR HIRING PROCEDURES, SALARY, AND TEACHING LOADS. THIS ARTICLE APPEARED IN THE "ADE BULLETIN," NUMBER 16, FEBRUARY 1968, PAGES 13-19. (BN)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ADE BULLETIN of the Association of Departments of English

Chairmen of Departments of English in American Colleges and Universities

Number 16 February 1968

ED016682

Teaching Conditions and Loads at San Francisco City College

By Donald Snepp
Chairman, Department of English
San Francisco City College

May I first say how honored I am to have been asked by the officers of ADE to speak to you this evening. Not only am I particularly happy to speak about the two-year college in California but, in another sense, to return to Chicago is in a way to be returning home for me since I grew up in Indianapolis and received my A.B. and M.A. from Indiana University. However, I must also admit that it was twenty-one years ago that I left Indiana University to enter the graduate school at the University of California at Berkeley and those twenty-one years have resulted among other things in my development of a genuine affection and respect for the educational system of the state in which I now reside. I am afraid it is still unfortunately the characteristic of many people living East of the Mississippi River to feel that not much worthwhile happens West of that liquid line, and I must recall the quotation upon a plaque on the old City Hall of Indianapolis. It seems that a former mayor of Indianapolis had been asked to speak about his city after the mayors of much larger and more glamorous cities had been lauding their particular homes to the sky. This particular Indianapolis mayor, borrowing a phrase from the Apostle Paul, started his speech by saying, "I am myself the citizen of no mean city." I should like to borrow all of that phrase except the last word and to state at the outset of this talk that in spite of the many prestigious institutions represented here I do feel very strongly that I am myself the citizen of no mean college. I make these remarks in spite of recent electoral catastrophes that have occured in our state. I am appalled at the disservice that has in one year been done higher education in California. I know how glamorous California seems to so many, but these are frightening times, and too many idiots have elected too many madmen to positions where they can cause irreparable damage. The crowds are restless and the martyrs are selected, and since there are so many coliseums and zoos in California, you can understand why many of us are so nervous.

For several obvious reasons I should not presume to comment on the reasons for the present frustrations and disappointments being experienced by administrators and teachers in the state colleges and at the various campuses at the University of California. However, I can certainly state that the primary frustration of many of the chairmen of English departments in two-year colleges in the State of California is the result of attempting desperately to fulfill our obligations to a constantly and amazingly increasing student body. Some of you are teaching and many of you have taught, I am sure, under some aspect of the master plan for education in California. While this plan certainly has its defects, I sincerely believe that its concept is quite magnificent, and I further feel that if this plan is significantly tampered with, it will be one of the most deplorable circumstances brought about in recent years. The two-year college, as you all know, is a very important part of this plan and fortunately, since all two-year colleges in California are under the jurisdiction and the financial purlieu of their own local districts and not the state, most of them, and may this luck continue, have up to now escaped the chilling touch of fiscal Sacramento. Of course, local tax measures and bond issues are not always approved, but at least the problem <u>is</u> local and often can be analyzed and ameliorated by persons who are close to and know the problems.

Of course, the concept of the junior college, the city college, the community college, or the two-year college -- which ever name you choose -- is far from new. However, many two-year colleges in the United States do charge tuition and do have, in many cases, quite stringent entrance requirements. In these two aspects the California two-year college differs most completely from its eastern or mid-western counterpart. No public two-year college in California charges tuition of any kind nor demands an entrance requirement beyond high school graduation. The term most often used to describe the California two-year college entrance requirement is that it is an "open-door" college. This door, however, does not always remain "open" nor is it a constantly revolving door. It very frequently closes in a rather final fashion upon the student who does not maintain a certain grade-point average. I do not have this year's figures and percentages for the number of CCSF students told to go elsewhere to improve their grade-point averages. However, I remember that during my last year in charge of the Re-Admissions Committees, 1964-5, when our enrollment was about 7,000 students, that the "open-door" closed on about 700 students, or roughly 10 percent. These were students whose grade-point averages had fallen below C-, or 1.5. Almost all these students had been on probation the previous semsster, and had not during that time decreased their grade-point deficiency. Each disqualified student was told that he would be re-admitted to the college when he had brought school courses, or regular courses from other colleges. One should realize from these figures, I think, that our college is not a blindly charitable, therapeutic institution.

Now may I speak briefly of the size and growth of the two-year college in California. Ten years ago there were in California sixty-one two-year colleges. There are at the present time eighty-eight. There will be by 1970 one hundred. This year there are enrolled in these eighty-eight colleges five hundred and seventy thousand students. By 1970 the estimate is that there will be in the one hundred or perhaps more two-year colleges in California close to a million students. On the fifth of this month I attended at Laney College in Oakland, California an articulation conference in English for colleges in the greater bay area, and there were represented at that conference four state colleges and fourteen junior colleges, and this number of two-year colleges, as I'm sure you realize, would seem insignificant indeed compared to the number of state colleges and two year colleges that now service the Los Angeles and San Diego area.

Seventy to eighty percent of the students graduating from two year colleges go on to four-year colleges and universities. Last year this number was twenty-nine thousand. The number of students going to four-year institutions from two-year colleges, however, is much larger than this, because many students transfer out of the two-year college to a four-year institution after their first year. This number is about twenty thousand, so we may say that we are transferring into four-year institutions from the two-year college about fifty thousand students a year. In fact, a recent study indicated that over half of the junior classes in California state colleges and universities are transfer students, and it is also a fact that the great majority of these transfer students have come from two-year colleges. As I have said, our two-year colleges do vary significantly, I believe, from most of the other two-year colleges in the United States; however, I must also add that our colleges also differ in varying ways within the State. There is the smaller two-year college still without tuition or stringent entrance requirements but serving, however, a solid suburban, middle-class community. I cannot speak about the curricula of such colleges and I must make it clear at this point that my only experience has been in an urban, multi-racial, comprehensive California two-year college.

City College of San Francisco is not extremely large. Our day-time enrollment is about ten thousand students and our evening division enrolls about twenty-seven hundred. By 1970 we expect to have fifteen thousand day students and five thousand in the evening division. Some of you may be surprised at the relatively small size of our evening division but may I say that we do not offer courses that are in many cases courses in general adult education. We have had in San Francisco for many years a very ambitious program in adult education. At City College, then, we offer in our evening division only graded instruction in the courses that we offer in the day-time as well.

I think you might be interested in the nature of our enrollment at City College. Among graduating seniors from San Francisco high schools the top twelve and one-half percent are eligible for the University of California. At City College seven percent of our students could have gone to the University. Among high school graduates the top thirty-three and one-third percent were eligible for state colleges. At City College thirty percent of our student body could have gone to state colleges. In other words, thirty-seven percent of our student body could have immediately attended a four-year college or university had they chosen to or been financially able to go. As you have gathered, all high school graduates are eligible for City College of San Francisco. Since roughly two-thirds of our student body were not originally eligible for a four-year institution, you may ask how do we deal with these students and what do we offer them.

First of all, we salvage a great many of these students, particularly the "late-bloomer," by increasing their ability to the point that they can become eligible for a four-year college or a university. I think it is interesting to note that of the number of students that we transfer to the University of California each year twenty percent started in our lowest terminal Communications course. This is the course that is below what most of you know at a four-year institution as the remedial or as the Subject A course, and this course is offered mainly for students who do not have the inclination or the ability or the time or the money to complete a four-year education. For these students the college offers thirty-nine separate two-year technical curricula varying in difficulty all the way from a program in Ornamental Horticulture, which does not require an exacting set of prerequisites, up to five different Engineers Council for Professional Development programs in engineering technology. The stature and reputation of these five engineering programs is beyond question and I believe we are one of the few two-year colleges in the United States offering such a range of engineering technology. We also have technical programs in hotel and restaurant management, photography, criminology, data processing, advertising art, real estate, traffic and transportation, nursing, graphic arts, and radiology, to mention only a few. Students completing these technology courses receive an Associate of Arts degree but they have followed a set curriculum and this curriculum has included quite a few different required courses, among these courses certainly being English. So our great challenge at City College of San Francisco is to attempt to keep continually improving a sufficient curriculum to take into account the range, the ability, the interest of our extremely varied student body.

Each year we graduate from twelve to fourteen hundred students. Of this number one thousand go on to universities and fouryear institutions, and these colleges and universities report back to us upon the progress of these students. We find, for instance, that our transfers to the University of California usually drop three to four-tenths of a grade-point their first semester but that by the time they are entering their senior year they are on the same academic level as the average student who is spending his fourth year at the university. We like to feel that these statistics indicate that our transfer curriculum is good, and we, moreover, feel that our technical curriculum is effective as well, for we constantly are checking with the students' employers, the advisory committees of various business institutions, and the technical advisors of these thirty-nine curricula are constantly checking with employers in the business community, attempting to find ways in which our technical curricula may also be improved. Our challenge, then, as a college, is continually to conduct as competently as possible an adequate program for the student who wishes to transfer to a four-year college or university, a program for the student who is most interested in a two-year technical program, and, between these two groups, a large number of students who enroll in general education, later making their decision as to whether or not they will continue and if they do continue, whether they will do so in a technical program or in a college or university transfer program. This tripartite concern of the college is also the concern of the English Department.

At City College of San Francisco our English Department includes Communications, English composition, English literature, Humanities, Speech, Classics, English as a Second Language, and Reading. Not included in the English Department are the subdepartments of Drama and Television and Radio Broadcasting. These are under the supervision of one of the deans of our college, the former chairman of the English Department. The present English Department numbers seventy instructors and we expect that

for next fall we will probably hire seven instructors for growth, eight instructors for load reduction, and possibly one or two instructors for retirement. This will bring the size of the department to eighty-five instructors. May I briefly mention how we select our instructors. In the first place, there are between four and five hundred applications for employment to the English Department each year. Of these four or five hundred probably a hundred to a hundred and fifty are, of course, impossible for one reason or another. I still get letters from applicants stating that they will be best at teaching upper division courses and graduate seminars and I am tempted usually to reply that they are probably confusing City College of San Francisco with City College of New York. There are always ten or twenty letters coming from East of the Mississippi River saying, "Is there anything available in the bay area; I cannot stand another winter like the last one." There are usually fifty or more from ladies who state, "My husband will be teaching in the bay area, and I also would like to teach there." My attention to these requests is proportionate to the number of children the family has and the age of the children. For, as you would all agree, an English faculty's strength is not exactly increased by ladies who consider their household duties and parental obligations before their obligation to the teaching profession. Out of the four or five hundred applicants perhaps fifty have not yet obtained their Master's Degree but expect to receive it the following June. This always presents difficulty sinee we hire no one who does not already have his Masters or for whom his M.A. is not assured. A Masters Degree obtained rather late may very well present credentialing difficulties and besides, it is the ironclad policy of our department to hire no one without a Masters. In fact, the majority of the applicants whom we accept have not only their Masters degree but a considerable number of graduate hours beyond that degree. So, after certain withdrawals, some indicated by me and some indicated by the applicants we emerge each year with about one hundred and fifty applicants for about ten to fifteen positions or less. After further screening by me, we interview during the months of February, March, and, sometines, early April approximately seventy candidates. These candidates are interviewed by the English Department Personnel Committee consisting of six members, most of whom are rather senior, and each applicant, whose complete files have been previously studied by the Committee, is interviewed for from ten to twenty minutes. From these seventy applicants each member of the Personnel Board ranks his top twenty and I compile the list. The Personnel Board usually offers me the privilege of indicating to them any candidate with whom I feel it might be impossible for me to work, and it seems that we have up to now had complete agreement on this count. I then submit this list to our President who interviews the applicants from the top of our list downwards. He also has a surprising accord with our recommendations and when he has reservations about any particular applicant, I relay his feelings to the Personnel Board. We have had through the years a remarkable record of success in hiring teachers whom I honestly feel are quite competent and devoted. Each instructor is on probation for three years, but we feel that the first year of an instructor's work provides enough time in which we may conclude whether he should be retained. Since we frequently hire instructors as long-term substitutes, sometimes for a semester and sometimes for a year, we have a departmental policy of not retaining an instructor beyond that one year unless we are willing to offer him a regular appointment.

Why do we receive so many applications? I like to think that one of the reasons is that City College of San Francisco enjoys a very respectable reputation. I also am very thankful that our college is located in San Francisco, which is certainly not one of the most unattractive cities on earth. I was, in fact, last year able to send an English department chairman of a California State College not quite so fortunate in his geographical surroundings two of the applicants to our institution whom we did not employ but whom he did. In considering possible reasons for these applications, I purposely mention last a reason more and more frequently mentioned by applicants to our colleges for their desire to teach with us. Many state their desire to start upon a career which is mainly concerned with teaching in an institution where they can both teach college and university transfer work and where they can do remedial teaching, salvaging students who would not under prevailing university systems be able to survive. We are particularly interested in applicants who, in addition to having a solid A.B. and M.A. in English, have also had experience in the Peace Corps, Vista, the teaching of the disadvantaged, the teaching of upward bound programs, and instructors who have voluntarily done tutorial work for students who require more help and individual assistance than the university

student with his superior background and higher motivation. We are happy, pleased, and proud to employ Ph.D.s in English if, in addition to their excellent background, they also demonstrate this type of special interest so necessary in an urban, multi-racial, comprehensive community. As a result of our hiring procedures, we have an English faculty of varied background and a high level of competence and interest in their students.

I should like to mention, very briefly, our English Department curriculum at City College. It is first of all rather complicated, because it has incorporated into it many screens, hurdles, and prerequisites, established most of all for the student's good -- to keep him foom attempting to over-reach himself and to protect him from entering a class in which he could not possibly compete. I suppose that the most obvious difference between the curriculum of a two-year college and that of a four-year college or university is the very obvious fact that we only offer the first two years. However, the second and almost equally obvious difference is the fact that almost all English Departments in large, urban, two-year colleges in California do have a very substantial third track or a track below the remedial Subject A course. The number of students enrolled in this third track, as I shall indicate in a moment, is quite substantial indeed.

Our entering students are classified in two ways -- by entrance examinations and by writing. First, they take entrance examinations which for us are largely involved with Co-Op test and the SCAT test. All students making 158 standard scale scores or above on both sides of the Co-Op are classified "excused," because no two-year college can require English 1A. However, those students who are excused are eligible for 1A and the majority of students do take 1A if they are eligible for it. The remaining entering students, after the English 1A students have been selected, are then split at 293 standard verbal scale score of SCAT. Those above go into our remedial track Communications 6, and those below go into our lower track called by some two-year colleges a "terminal" track. We do not like this term because first it sounds like a disease and secondly it has implications of sealing a student into a lead coffin and sending him out on his limited way. We provide escape hatches throughout our whole English curriculum for students who are improving to go upward into higher courses. Our lowest level is not a repetitive grammar drill course; it is a general education course offered largely for students who will complete only two years in the two-year college and who will not transfer to a four-year institution. For this student, we offer a grammar review and help, we hope, in writing, in spelling, in reading and a bit of the humanities -- offering work in the short story, the novel, satire, drama, and poetry.

After these entrance examinations are completed and the students have been placed in a class, each student in 5A, the lowest level, which is part of a two-semester course, 5A and 5B, each student in Communications 6, which is a one-semester remedial course for 1A hopefuls, and each who is classified "excused" and is taking English 1A writes a theme in his class during the first week of the semester and then further changes are made upon the recommendations of the instructor. Unless the student is legally eligible by other prerequisites, he will for his own good and upon the sincere persuasion of his instructor move downward or sometimes upward to a different level. You may be interested in knowing the numbers of students in such a division. Last fall we had about 1,200 entering students eligible for English 1A, and about the same number, 1,200, eligible for Communications of the remedial level. And, last fall for the lower level, 5A, we had 80 sections, or about 2,600 students. In addition to these basic communications or composition tracks, we offer every course that is offered at the University of California at Berkeley during its first two years and all of the parallel courses at City College transfer to the University of California or to any state college at full credit.

I wish there were time to speak to you a bit longer about our reading and ESL programs. I shall only briefly say this: First, some of you may be amazed that reading is taught in college, but we are speaking here about the facts of life. The facts are that some of our students do not read very well. The facts are that some university students do not read very well either, but in our particular situation we are faced perhaps with more glaring deficiencies. A part of our entrance battery is the short form of the Cal

Test in Phonics, written by Dr. Brown and Dr. Cottrell. A student scoring very low in phonics is recommended to our English K, which is a course in phonics. A student who rates high in phonics but is very low in reading speed and composition, if he is on the lower level, is recommended to take our English 9, a lower level reading course. If the student is in the upper level and still has reading deficiencies, it is recommended that he take our English 19, which is a special reading course for university parallel students. I shall only say here that statistics are convincing to us that we should continue this program. Secondly -- our ESL Program. We are this year greatly enlarging and completely revising this program. In San Francisco we have a perhaps unique situation; the United States immigration policy has changed in the last few years in that more and more Chinese people are being admitted to the United States. We expect this year, for instance, that 10,000 Hong Kong Chinese will arrive in San Francisco. Of this group some will go to Santa Rosa, Stockton, San Jose and other areas close to the Bay Area where there are Chinese communities. A great many of them, however, will remain in San Francisco and of this 10,000 we estimate that about 1,000 will be enrolled in our schools, most of them in various levels of San Francisco high schools. We are now at the point where almost every one of our 5A sections includes three, four or five Chinese, sometimes Spanish, students for whom we realize that course was not designed. Estimating conservatively, I feel that instead of having 80 sections of 5A perhaps we should have closer to 50 sections of 5A and 30 sections of ESL with special instruction for students for whom English is a second language but who have the ability to improve their English to a point where they may compete with native speakers in a college situation.

Having spoken of hiring and of curriculum, may I next speak briefly of load. Many of you cringe when I say that up until this year our regular teaching load was 18 units. I must say immediately that this 18 unit load did not apply to writing classes, and since our English 1B is a writing course with an eight to ten thousand word expectation, just as 1A, many instructors, you will realize, have all writing classes and will not be able to pick up a purely literary course until perhaps their third, fourth, or fifth year at the college. Our differential has been 1.2 units for each unit of a writing course, and 15 units of writing or five classes multiplied by the 1.2 differential comes out at 18. So, for the majority of our instructors, our teaching load was five writing classes or 15 hours a week. Though we do have readers to assist instructors in grading compositions, one can see very easily that 5 times 30, or a total student contact of 150, is completely out of the question. Our administration has for some time been sympathetic to the impossibility of the situation, but I must say that the added weight of the NCTE Guidelines for faculty teaching load, plus the effort of our Academic Senate, resulted this year in a reduction from five writing classes to four, or from 15 hours to 12. Our differential was changed from 1.2 to 1.25, and our President allowed the English Department to hire half the number of people needed for load reduction this year, and the other half by next year. In other words, during this academic year, the English Department is halfway toward its load reduction and if an instructor has had five writing classes one semester, he has four writing classes the other. Our complete reduction in load will be accomplished by next September, when all instructors teaching all writing courses will be down to four classes. If one or two classes in an instructor's load are literature classes, he will occasionally have to teach an extra class to keep up to what is really a 15 unit load if non-writing courses are considered. I might mention here that our literature courses are being put on a rotation basis so that more instructors may have the opportunity of teaching these more attractive courses. Since we have accomplished this much in the reduction of the number of classes taught, and since we are not apt to be able to decrease this aspect of load any time in the near future, our next great task is to get the sizes of the writing classes reduced. Many of our composition classes, particularly in the lower levels, are still closing at 32 or perhaps 33 students, which means that at the end of the semester the instructor still has 27 or 28 students. We hope that in the near future we may close our composition classes at 28 students, which would allow the instructor to work down toward a closing figure of around 25 students. This number admittedly is still too large, but

we are working downward from the point where we are.

May I conclude my remarks by briefly mentioning our salaries, since Dr. Daniel and Dr. Shugrue have indicated that you might be interested in them. Our basic beginning salary for an instructor without full-time teaching experience is $8,500. By a series of increments and credit for other experience we are able in some cases where an instructor has had four, five or six years of experience to start him at $9,300 or perhaps $9,500. We are on a single salary schedule which moves up at increments of $375 a year until, at the end of twelve years, the instructor has reached the present maximum of $14,500. When our sabbatical leave situation was upon half-pay basis for either one or two semesters, an instructor could get a sabbatical just about any time he was eligible for it. However, about a year ago our rules changed and now instructors in the city system (of which we are still a part, because our boundaries are exactly those of the city of San Francisco) may take a one-semester sabbatical at full pay. When that happened many financial conservatives came out of the woodwork to take a one-semester sabbatical and now we are not quite sure where we stand. However, up to this point our sabbatical policy has been quite lenient. Our Academic Senate is presently requesting that the precentage of sabbaticals allowable be increased, and then all instructors would again be able immediately to receive a sabbatical as soon as eligible.

In closing, may I once more thank the ADE for the honor of speaking to you. May I thank you for your attention and interest. My subject has admittedly been too great for the time allotted me, but I <u>have</u> attempted to say something of the two-year college, <u>my</u> college, its general aims and curriculum, of our English Department and its staff and curriculum, hiring procedures, salary and load. I could never, however, adequately descr be to you how each of these aspects is so closely related to <u>practical</u> considerations, nor how so many members of the Department give devotion, loyalty, and hard work far beyond a level you might suspect, mainly because of a conviction that we are doing a great deal of good for a great many particularly deserving students.

In the years ahead, we in the two-year college will probably continue to "trail behind" the four-year college and university in load reduction. However, it is of the utmost importance that all of you continue your good work along these lines so that we of the two-year college can benefit from your successes and achievements. The better job that we can do with lighter loads will undoubtedly be evident in the training received by many of the students entering your colleges as juniors and seniors.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Assoc. of Departments of English TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

© Association of Departments of English, 1968

and practical implications of plan. Many meetings held: develop into action and reaction rather than thought sessions, between the older members against the newer. Finally vote taken, plan wins 5-4, one voter a young instructor not returning following year and without even an M.A. in English.

Chairman subsequently refuses to institute new plan with a group so obviously divided, despite vote. Ultimately gets established rule that a two-thirds majority must be needed for such major curriculum change, meanwhile quite naturally having incurred wrath and suspicion of young progressives. But a new freshman course set up, using paperbacks, and generally following a great books approach.

Following year this freshman course comes in for attack: What are we really trying to do here? How can we have time for the writing of themes? We jump around too much--there is no discernable pattern to the course. Late spring finds Department strongly voting to return to an anthology, chosen by committee. Following fall (influence of four new members slowly being felt, for the good), members discover they chose an inferior anthology, after the first term, and it is decided to allow use of an alternate.

Meanwhile, new chairman gets wind of ADE Seminar at Penn State, and, haggard and paranoid, clutches at its possibilities. Goes and enjoys self, learns much. In fact, reoreients whole approach to running the Department, or what might better be called, running <u>from</u> the Department. Key idea came over a drink or some fruit cup or casually somewhere he cannot recall: To set up a "Steering Committee", to be elected by the members, with one member from each rank. That meant three members, there being no instructor rank represented in the Department. Chairman had been exercising a vote on all issues; this he saw as a mistake, and he decided to give this practice up (justified, he felt, as his was the highest student load in the Department). He also decided to have fewer meetings, a suggestion picked up from the Dean of the University of Illinois in his talk.

Comes the fall. Chairman at first meeting springs idea of Steering Committee on group, makes them vote -- and they vote in just the right trio, exactly the three he would have appointed. It is now December vacation, and all is quiet. The Steering Committee has met almost weekly (in the Committee chairman's office-their elected chairman--not in the Department Chairman's office). This group has shown great sense and has aided the Chairman immeasurably. They report at the regular monthly Department meeting; one member of the Committee was an original drafter of the radical (or if you will, progressive) plan --- now, having tasted some of the lemon juice of making decisions between two imperfect alternatives, he is less raucous, more judicious.

As the snow drifts lazily down outside the windows, members contemplate not one but what are now four new plans to decide upon for the freshman-sophomore over-haul, plans that have been hatched from time to time since the initial plan in the fall of 1965. All have been discussed at some length.

And the chairman reached a decision just before the vacation: He issued the pronouncement that at the first meeting after vacation each member would read a document no longer than one page type-written single-spaced in which he defends his own particular choice dittoing copies for colleagues to study after the meeting. There would then be three more meetings on subsequent Tuesdays, in January.

If no one plan could be decided upon by January 30, the entire subject will be dropped for the remainder of the year, and the old tried-and-not-altogether-found-wanting original system will carry on as before.

--- and here we shall leave our chairman and our Department, determined to face the new year with that great and cursed measure of independence for which English professors are famous, leaving in the balance the question: to hang together or to hang separately? To remain true to one's purity of principle and stifle action, or to give a little here and there and move - in some direction? We make no predictions; we merely see through a glass darkly.